

istration, I have noted that coordination, in this sense, inevitably causes more problems than it is supposed to cure.

Frankly, I would go much farther the other way. The administrative weakness of the Office of Economic Opportunity is precisely because Mr. Shriver, the administrator, does not have enough power at present over the work in the established Departments. I can think of no way in which he could secure such power except by pulling the functions out of the established Departments and placing them completely in the Office of Economic Opportunity. This would include budget, personnel and all the tools of policy and administrative control.

Occasionally, in times of crisis, this direct measure is the only one that works effectively. An analogy you may find pertinent was the administrative decision prior to World War II to center Latin American affairs in the White House under Nelson Rockefeller instead of the State Department. Complete control was given to Mr. Rockefeller. It proved a most efficient operation. After the crisis had passed, the functions were returned to the State Department.

If, then, the functions you describe as now in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Labor and the Department of Defense were transferred wholly and completely to the Office of Economic Opportunity for the next several years, the results would be far more spectacular and successful than they now are.

I recognize my answer goes far beyond your question. It follows then, if you will not take the centralizing step I have suggested, that I much prefer the present administrative structure to the weak form suggested by Congressmen Quie and Goodell.

I think you will find nothing in what I have said to be inconsistent with the principles enacted by the First Hoover Commission of which I was a member.

I much appreciate your having asked for my opinion.

Respectfully,

JAMES ROWE.

JULY 26, 1967.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

In re telegram of twenty-first, based upon my experience in Treasury and Health Education and Welfare Departments and local experience, I am convinced that the separate independent agency as now functioning can be more effective in directing national effort against poverty than to distribute functions to regular departments. Individual programs can be transferred as is already being done when experience indicates that functions can be carried on effectively in departments. Actual experience with War Production Board and Marshall Plan clearly demonstrated the need for separate independent agency to obtain results in a major specific project which affects many different agencies whose prime concerns are in other fields.

MARION B. FOLSOM.

FOSTORIA CORP.,
July 26, 1967.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PERKINS: As both a fellow citizen and a businessman, I feel compelled to write you expressing my growing concern about the current House debate concerning the War on Poverty.

I personally have followed closely for some three years the formation and operation of this program. I believe it is one of the truly significant contributions of our generation to meet one of the oldest and most difficult problems that has always plagued mankind.

I am gratified today to see most of the OEO's pioneering programs now showing both tangible results and increasing public acceptance. The question today does not seem to be whether these programs should be continued, but rather could they not be done better or more economically by dispersal of the OEO functions to other agencies?

This is an entirely reasonable question deserving careful analysis. In this regard, the following related questions are pertinent: